REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

In item 2 on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-4 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Halff et al. (US Pat. No. 4,903,560) in view of Yokoyama et al. (US Pat. No.4,662,234) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 3 on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 5 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Halff et al. in view of Yokoyama et al. and further in view of Bahnmüller (US Pat. No. 3,815,494) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections have been noted and claim 1 has been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found in Fig. 2 of the drawings.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

> said non-uniformly acting mechanism including an elliptical gear and an asymmetrical gear.

As can be clearly seen from Fig. 2 of the drawings of the instant application, the gear (25) has a very specific form, which is not symmetrical, like a wheel or egg-shaped or an elliptical. This specific combination of the elliptical gear (24) and the asymmetrical gear (25) leads to the specific advantages which are, for example, described on pages 12-13 of the instant application. This specific combination is not shown in any of the cited references.

Clearly, none of the references shows "said non-uniformly acting mechanism including an elliptical gear and an asymmetrical gear," as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since dependent claims 2-3 and 5 are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurence A. Greenberg (29,308)

YC

October 6, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101